

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. Claims 5, 12, and 19 are canceled by this response without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-21 are rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants traverse these rejections and respectfully request reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended as indicated above, such amendments being supported at least by figures 1 and 2 and the associated paragraphs of the specification and the claims as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

#### **Applicant's Statement re Interview with Examiner**

Preliminarily, Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interview of January 17, 2012, during which the Applicants' representative and the Examiner discussed the current rejections. Specifically, the rejection of claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Colasurdo was discussed. Although potential amendments were discussed, no agreement was reached at this time. In accordance with that discussion, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8 and 15 as indicated above. The remarks submitted herewith reflect the discussion and arguments presented during that conversation.

#### **Rejections Under 35 USC § 103(a)**

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,128,279 to O'Neil et al., (hereinafter "O'Neil"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,748,448 to Barrera et al., (hereinafter "Barrera"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,543,066 to Colasurdo. Claims 1-21 are alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,954,783 to Bodwell et al., (hereinafter "Bodwell") and further in view of Colasurdo. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Independent claims 1, 8 and 15 each recite in part:

A method comprising:

if the data comprises at least one Uniform Resource Locator (URL):

*modifying] the data at the processor* by adding an identity of the first server to the at least one URL that would initiate a subsequent request from the client computer;

*forwarding] the modified data from the processor* to the client computer *wherein subsequent requests initiated from the at least one URL as modified* and received from the client computer *include said first server identity*;

Applicants submit that the cited references do not teach, suggest or describe at least the identified subject matter.

Colasurdo has been identified as allegedly disclosing the above identified limitations of the independent claims. See Advisory Action dated January 4, 2012 at page 3. In the conversation of January 17, the Examiner indicated that Colasurdo discloses a server that performs both the modifying and the forwarding limitations of the rejected claims. Applicants respectfully disagree. As disclosed in Colasurdo:

When a server creates a session, it assigns a unique session ID value that is sent back to the client machine under the name jsessionid. Thereafter, *the client machine will include the session ID in all requests issued to that server farm*. The session ID might be sent in a cookie that forms part of the request. Alternately, it might be appended to the URI of the request in a mechanism known as URL rewriting. [Colasurdo at 4:6-13].

When a browser sends a request via the Internet that is directed to the server farm 12, *the http server 13 receives the request*. Http server 13, running a request dispatch routine for directing requests to an appropriate server based on factors such as content-based rules, load balancing rules and session affinity rules, reviews the request to determine to which server it must be dispatched. [Colasurdo at 7:50-56].

*The selected server then receives the request and can retrieve the session data as needed* (from its own local memory, if that server had serviced previous requests sharing the same session ID, or, if not, from a session database or other session persistence mechanism, if one is used). [Colasurdo at 7:66-8:2].

Using the server farm of FIG. 1 as an example, let us assume that a session between a particular client machine 16 and the server farm 12 has been created and serviced in the front-end application server group 14, and particularly server 14<sub>3</sub>. In accordance with the invention, *server 14<sub>3</sub> created the following jsessionid cookie*:

jsessionId=abcdefg:ucidsg14c3. [Colasurdo at 8:50-57].

Let us assume that the individual operating the client machine then proceeds to check out. Thus, the next series of requests will be serviced by a clone in server group 15. Accordingly, the URI associated with checking out identifies server group 15 and the request dispatcher running in the http server 13 selects one of the clones in server group 15 to service the request, e.g., clone 15<sub>2</sub>. *That clone then appends to the jsessionId in the relevant cookie a second unique clone identification code* as shown below: jsessionId=abcdefg:ucidsg14c3:ucidsg15c2 (3). [Colasurdo at 9:1-12].

Thus as disclosed in Colasurdo, a client computer formulates the request by including the session ID or cookie in the request. Then a first server 13 receives the request and dispatches it to a server 14<sub>n</sub> / 15<sub>n</sub>. That server 14<sub>n</sub> / 15<sub>n</sub> then creates the cookie or session ID that identifies the specific server. As previously noted, this is not the same as a single processor that is adapted to send the request to a first server, receive the data from the first server, modify the data, forward the modified data to the client computer, and send each subsequent request to the identified server as claimed.

Additionally, citing Colasurdo at 8:1-25, the Advisory Action indicates that Colasurdo discloses a “front end request dispatch software module [that] receives requests corresponding to any given session and server group” and further “directs [the requests] always to the same clone in the server group whenever possible.” The Advisory Action indicates that Colasurdo then forwards the modified session ID to the client computer where “the client machine will include the session ID in all requests issued to that server farm.” See Advisory Action at page 3-4.

Thus Colasurdo discloses nothing more than modifying a session ID that may be sent to the client, for example as a cookie or appended to the URI for the original request. The session ID may then be used by the client computer in forming subsequent requests. This is not the same as modifying the requested data, by adding an identity of the first server to at least one URL of the requested data and then forwarding the modified data to the client computer such that subsequent requests initiated from the requested data as modified are directed to the first server without any amendment to the request by the client computer as claimed in the rejected

claims.

In order to support a proper § 103(a) rejection, the cited references must include a similar teaching, suggestion or description of every element of the rejected claims. For at least the above reasons, Applicants maintain neither the combination of O'Neil, Barrera, and Colasurdo nor the combination of O'Neil, Bodwell, and Colasurdo disclose every limitation of independent claims 1, 8 and 15. Therefore Applicants respectfully submit that the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 8, and 15 is lacking and should be withdrawn. Claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-11, 13-14, 16-18, and 20-21 depend from and further define allowable independent claims 1, 8, and 15 respectively, and therefore are allowable as well.

**Request for Allowance**

For at least the above reasons, it is believed that this Response places the application in condition for allowance, and early favorable consideration of this Response is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,  
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Date: January 19, 2012

By: /Michelle McLeod/  
Michelle McLeod  
(Reg. No. 63,282)

Customer No.: **25693**

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
1801 Page Mill Road, Suite 210  
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Telephone: (650) 384-4700  
Facsimile: (650) 384-4701